UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/726,449	12/02/2003	Dimitre Hristov Hristov	2003P11789US	6754	
7590 06/28/2007 Siemens Corporation Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Administrator			EXAMINER		
			LEE, SHUN K		
Intellectual Property Department 170 Wood Avenue South			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Iselin, NJ 0883	0		2884		
					
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		•	06/28/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/726,449	HRISTOV ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Shun Lee	2884		

•	Examine	Aiconic	
	Shun Lee	2884	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>18 June 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin	g date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final reject	ion.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
<u></u>	but prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered b	
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be 	• •	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	cotod alaima	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		•	,
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wi vided below or appended.	II be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>10-18,20,22,23 and 25-30</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, by because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	ut before or on the date of filing a N ad sufficient reasons why the affidat	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other: See Continuation Sheet.	(A (M)	7
		SIIII	
		DAVID PORTA	
	SUPERV	ISORY PATENT EXAM	INER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the reasons discussed in the previous office action.

Continuation of 13. Other: applicant argues (third to fifth paragraphs on pg. 2 of remarks filed 18 June 2007) that the final rejection is premature since it introduced a new ground of rejection in regard at least to pending claim 10. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Pending claim 10 was amended to incorporate limitations recited in canceled claim 19. Thus pending claim 10 is in essence canceled claim 19. It is noted that canceled claim 19 was rejected (see pp. 5-6 of office action mailed 19 October 2005) under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrillo in view of Pochwalski. Pending claim 10 was rejected (see pp. 3-5 of office action mailed 19 October 2005) under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petrillo in view of Pochwalski. Thus pending claim 10 was rejected on the same grounds as canceled claim 19. Therefore any new ground of rejection was necessitated by Applicant's amended or new claims. In addition, applicant states (last paragraph on pg. 2 of remarks filed 18 June 2007) that there was no intention of changing representative information. However, the power of attorney filed 2 December 2003 named a list of patent practitioners as representative whereas the Supplemental Application Data Sheet attempts to change the representative information by naming patent practitioners associated with a Customer Number as representative. An application data sheet cannot be used to revoke a power of attorney and/or grant a new power of attorney. Further, 37 CFR 1.76(c)(2) requires that a Supplemental Application Data Sheet must identify the information that is being changed, preferably with underlining for insertions and strike-through for text removed.